

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 14; claims 3 and 16 have been canceled. The Applicant has amended the claims to correct antecedent basis and more clearly claim the subject matter to which the Applicant is entitled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17-26 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1-11, 14-22, and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szienski (UK Patent Application GB 2 366134 A) in view of Muramatsu (US 2001/0012774 A1) and in further view of Suzuki (US 2001/0011032 A1). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the following limitations of claim 1 and claim 14:

1.

...instructions based on said power supply connections for one of receiving all of said data or receiving a portion of said data;

means for redirecting all of said data to a predetermined location;  
and

means for receiving the portion of said quantity of data and directing the remainder of said data to a predetermined address.  
(Emphasis added)

14.

....redirecting all of said data to a predetermined location; and

receiving a portion of said messages and directing the remainder of said messages to a predetermined address based on the power level; (Emphasis added)

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the Suzuki reference does not disclose the limitation of receiving a portion of data ('messages' in claim 14) and directing the remainder (data or messages) to another address. The Suzuki reference discloses (in the cited passage) that the main controller stores electronic mail data in mail storage and transmits stored electronic mail data. In other words, Suzuki stores incoming mail and can transmit mail from storage. There is no disclosure in Suzuki that incoming mail is separated with one portion going to one address and another portion of the incoming mail going to another address. The above limitations from claims 1 and 14 recites means for receiving a portion of data (messages) and sending the remainder of the data (messages) to another address.

As noted in the Detailed Action, Szienski does not teach or suggest receiving a portion of the data and directing the remaining portion of the data to a predetermined address. In addition, Muramatsu does not make up this missing limitation.

Thus, Szienski, Muramatsu and Suzuki, either individually or in combination do not teach or suggest all the limitations as recited in amended independent claim 1. Amended claim 14 includes limitations analogous to claim 1 and the emphasized limitations are also not taught or disclosed in either Szienski, Muramatsu and Suzuki. Claims 2, 4-11, and 26 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claims 15, 17-22 and 25 depend from amended claim 14 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 14. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14, 15, 17-22, and 25-26 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-13 and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szienski (UK Patent Application GB 2 366134 A) in view of Muramatsu (US 2001/0012774 A1) and further in view of Liebenow (6,459,896B1). The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 14 to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been corrected and now recites that the controller includes instructions based on the power supply connections for one of receiving all of the data, means for redirecting all of the data to a predetermined location, and means for receiving a portion of the data and directing the remainder of the data to a predetermined address. As discussed above, Szienski and Muramatsu do not teach or suggest redirecting all of the data to a predetermined location, or receiving a portion of the data and directing the remaining portion of the data to a predetermined address. The addition of Liebenow does not make up the missing elements.

Thus, the combination of Szienski, Muramatsu and Liebenow does not teach or suggest all the elements as recited in claim 1. Claim 14 contains limitations analogous to claim 1 and is also not taught or suggested by Szienski, Muramatsu and Liebenow. Claims 12 and 13 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claims 23 and 24 depend from amended claim 14 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 14. Therefore, the allowance of claims 12, 13, 23, and 24 is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: December 1, 2008

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com